

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Non-Final Office Action of July 15, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this amendment, Applicants hereby amend claims 6, 17, 18, 23, 25, 29, and 32-35 and respectfully submits no new matter has been entered by this amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit claims 3-6 and 13-35 are currently pending in the present application.

The Examiner objected to claims 23, 25, and 35 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a) due to the presence of typographical errors; rejected claims 3, 4, 16-21, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiraki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,504,522); rejected claims 5, 6, 13-15, 22, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,175,351); rejected claims 23, 24, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraki et al. in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,459); rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. in view of Lee; rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Shiraki et al. and Matsuura et al.; and rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Matsuura et al. and Shiraki et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and reconsideration is hereby requested.

The Examiner objected to claim 23 because the word “lines’,” in the phrase “in accordance with the data lines’ respective positions relative to a scanning line source,” should be amended to recite “lines”. Applicants respectfully submit, however, use of the word “lines’,” as used in the phrase above, is proper as “lines’” is being used in the plural possessive sense, not merely the sense. Similar arguments are equally applicable with respect to the objection to claim 25.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 35 is respectfully requested in view of the Amendments to the Claims above.

The rejection of claims 3, 4, 16-21, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiraki et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is hereby requested.

Claim 3 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 3 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "supplying data signal voltages to the signal wires having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning signal to the signal wires." None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 4 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 4 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "allowing the data signal voltages to be supplied to the signal wires to have a different width in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning wire." None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 16 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "signal side driving means for supplying data signal voltages having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source on the scanning wire to the signal wires." None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 18, which depend from claim 16, are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 19 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 19 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "width control means for making the data signal voltages to be supplied to the signal wires have a different width in accordance with a distance from a source on the scanning wire." None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20 and 21, which depend from claim 19, are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 31 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 31 recites a combination of

elements including, for example, “wherein the data signal voltages have varying widths depending on a distance of the data lines from the scanning signal sources.” None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 31, the Examiner cites Shiraki et al. as teaching “supplying data signal voltages SL1, SL2, SL3 having a width enlarged ($t_1 < t_2 < t_3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning signal to the signal wires GL1, GL2, GL3 (see figure 7, column 16, lines 60-67).” (Office Action at 5.)

Applicants respectfully submit, however, Shiraki et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements.

For example, Shiraki et al. teaches at column 9, lines 2-7 “...a gray-scale voltage V_x ... corresponding the digital picture signals DAT, through DAT₃ starts to be output to the source line S_{L1} when output Q₁ becomes active in one horizontal period, and continues to be output to the source line SL₁ until the output Q₁ becomes active again in the next horizontal period.” Further, at column 12, lines 46-52, Shiraki et al. states, “...by once making the discharge signal DIS active within a horizontal flyback period, the discharge voltage VDIS is output to the source lines SL until the outputs Q of the scanning circuits 11 corresponding to the respective source lines SL become active in the next horizontal period” and at column 12, lines 59-64 “...since the discharge time with respect to the last source line is longest (substantially one horizontal period), the discharge voltage VDIS compensates for the insufficient application of the gray-scale voltage. As a result, the gray-scale voltage is sufficiently applied to all of the source lines SL, thereby achieving high-quality displays.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claims 3, 4, and 31. For example, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. is silent as to any spatial relationship between a width of an outputted first signal and a source of a second signal. Similar arguments presented above with respect to the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 31 are equally applicable with respect to

the rejection of claims 16 and 19.

The rejection of claims 5, 6, 13-15, 22, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuura et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 5 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 5 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “supplying a scanning signal voltage having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wire to the scanning wire.” None of the cited references, including Matsuura et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 6 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 6 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “applying a scanning voltage having a width enlarged in accordance with a position of the signal wire relative to the scanning wire; and supplying data signal voltages having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning wire to the signal wires.” None of the cited references, including Matsuura et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Claim 13 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “width control means for allowing the scanning signal voltage to have a different width in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wire.” None of the cited references, including Matsuura et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 22 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 22 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “scanning side driving means for applying a scanning signal voltage having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wire to the scanning wire; and signal side driving means for supplying a data signal voltage having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning wire to the signal wire.” None of the cited references, including Matsuura et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Claim 32 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 32 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “wherein the scanning signal voltage has a varying width depending on a distance of the scanning lines from the scanning signal sources.” None of the cited references, including Matsuura et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 33 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 33 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “wherein the scanning signal voltage has a varying width depending on a distance of the scanning lines from the data signal sources.” None of the cited references, including Matsuura et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

With respect to the rejection of claims 5, 6, 22, and 32, the Examiner states Matsuura et al. teaches “supplying a scanning signal voltage having a width enlarged ($t_1 < t_2 < t_3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wires (see figure 14, column 23, lines 9-21).” (Office Action at 8.)

Applicants respectfully submit, however, Matsuura et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements.

For example, Matsuura et al. recites at column 23, lines 9-21 “...the ON period of all the scanning lines starts at time $[t_0]$, and terminates at gradually delaying times t_1, t_2, \dots and t_m , as the scanning proceeds from the first scanning line toward the m -th scanning line. In other words, the ON periods P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots and P_m for the scanning lines are longer in this order.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Matsuura et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claims 5, 6, 22, and 32. For example, Applicants respectfully submit Matsuura et al. is silent as to any spatial relationship between a width of an outputted first signal and a source of a second signal. Moreover, and specifically referring to the rejection of claims 6 and 22, Applicants respectfully submit Matsuura et al. fails to show at least “supplying data signal voltages having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning wire to the signal wires” (as required

by claim 6) and “signal side driving means for supplying a data signal voltage having a width enlarged in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning wire to the signal wire” (as required by claim 22). Lastly, similar arguments presented above with respect to the rejection of claims 5, 6, 22, and 32 are equally applicable with respect to the rejection of claims 13 and 33.

The rejection of claims 23, 24, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraki et al. in view of Lee is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 23 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 23 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuits connected to the scanning lines for applying scanning signals thereto; a plurality of data driver integrated circuits connected to the data lines for applying data signals thereto; and a width controller for varying widths of time periods during which the data signals are applied by the data driver integrated circuits to the data lines in accordance with the data lines’ respective positions relative to a scanning line source.” None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al. and Lee, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 which depends from claim 23, is also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 27 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 27 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “applying data line signals to each of the data lines, a first width of a first one of the data line signals applied to a first one of the data lines located a first distance from the scanning driver IC being greater than a second width of a second one of the data line signals applied to a second one of the data lines located a second distance from the scanning driver IC, wherein the first distance is greater than the second distance.” None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al. and Lee, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28, which depends from claim 27, is also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 29 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 29 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “applying data line signals from a plurality of data driver

integrated circuits (ICs) to the data lines of the LCD, each data line being connected at one end to one of the data driver ICs; and applying scanning line signals to each of the scanning lines, a first width of a first one of the scanning line signals applied to a first one of the scanning lines located a first distance from the data driver ICs being greater than a second width of a second one of the scanning line signals applied to a second one of the scanning lines located a second distance from the data driver ICs, wherein the first distance is greater than the second distance.” None of the cited references, including Shiraki et al. and Lee, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30, which depends from claim 29, is also allowable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejection of claims 23 and 24, the Examiner states Shiraki et al. “teach all of the claimed limitations, except for ‘a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuit, a plurality of data driver integrated circuits’,” and cites Lee as teaching “TFT-LCD having a plurality of data line driver integrated circuit packages 40, and a plurality of gate driver IC package 60 (see figure 1, col. 1, lines 23-28).” In concluding the rejection, the Examiner states it would have been obvious to “...utilize a plurality of gate driver IC and a plurality of data driver IC taught by Lee for the TFT-LCD driver circuit system disclosed by Shiraki et al because this would provide less image distortion due to cross talk between elements of the display (see col. 2, lines 35-36 of Lee).” (Office Action at 10.)

Initially, and for similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 3, 4, 16, 19, and 31, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claim 23, “except for ‘a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuit, a plurality of data driver integrated circuits’,” as asserted by the Examiner.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that while the Examiner correctly cites Lee as teaching “a plurality of data line driver integrated circuit packages 40, and a plurality of gate driver IC package 60,” the Examiner has improperly attributed a reduced “image distortion due to cross talk between elements of the display” as the result of utilizing “a plurality of gate driver IC and a plurality of data driver IC taught by Lee.” For example, Lee states at column 1, lines

61-65 “This distortion may be attributed to a distortion of the common electrode voltage on the common electrode layer 9 with respect to the other control signals applied to the LCD 5, e.g., the data signals applied to individual LCD elements.” At column 4, lines 31-44, Lee states “Each bonding substrate 70 also has first and second common electrode drivers 74a, 74b mounted thereon. A respective one of the first and second common electrode drivers 74a, 74b is electrically connected to a respective one of the first and second common electrode conductors 51a, 51b. ...As a respective one of the common electrode regions 11a, 11b is separately driven by a respective one of the common electrode drivers 74a, 74b, a more uniform common electrode potential can be produced on the common electrode regions 11.”

That all aspects of the claimed invention may have been individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit it would not be obvious combine Lee with Shiraki et al. at least because there is no evidence that a reduced image distortion, due to cross talk between elements of the display of Shiraki et al., would result simply by providing a plurality of gate and driver ICs, as asserted by the Examiner. Absent any objective evidence, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. has been combined with Lee using the presently claimed invention as a template, via impermissible hindsight.

Regarding the rejection of claims 27-30, the Examiner states Shiraki et al. teach “all of the claimed limitations, except for ‘a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuit, a plurality of data driver integrated circuits.’”

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 3, 4, 16, 19, 23, and 31, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claims 27 and 29, “except for ‘a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuit, a plurality of data driver integrated circuits’,” as asserted by the Examiner. Moreover, and for similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit there is no motivation or suggestion to combine Shiraki et al. with Lee and arrive at the invention defined in claim 29.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit claim 27 requires neither the “plurality of scanning driver integrated circuit[s]” nor the “plurality of data driver integrated circuit[s],” as asserted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit there is no motivation to combine Shiraki et al. with Lee and arrive at the invention defined by claim 27.

Lastly, and specifically referring to the rejection of claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. and Lee, either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least “applying scanning line signals to each of the scanning lines, a first width of a first one of the scanning line signals applied to a first one of the scanning lines located a first distance from the data driver ICs being greater than a second width of a second one of the scanning line signals applied to a second one of the scanning lines located a second distance from the data driver ICs, wherein the first distance is greater than the second distance.”

The rejection of claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. in view of Lee is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 25 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 25 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuits connected to the scanning lines for applying scanning signals thereto; a plurality of data driver integrated circuits connected to the data lines for applying data signals thereto; and a controller for varying widths of time periods during which the scanning signals are applied by the scanning driver integrated circuits to the scanning lines in accordance with the scanning lines’ respective positions relative to a data line source.” None of the cited references, including Matsuura et al. and Lee, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26, which depends from claim 25, is also allowable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejection of claims 25 and 26, the Examiner states Matsuura et al. teaches “all of the claimed limitations, except for ‘a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuit, a plurality of data driver integrated circuits,” and cites Lee as teaching “TFT-LCD having a plurality of data line driver integrated circuit packages 40, and a plurality of gate driver IC

package 60 (see figure 1, col. 1, lines 23-28).” In concluding the rejection, the Examiner states it would have been obvious to “...utilize a plurality of gate driver IC and a plurality of data driver IC taught by Lee for the TFT-LCD driver circuit system disclosed by Shiraki et al because this would provide less image distortion due to cross talk between elements of the display (see col. 2, lines 35-36 of Lee).” (Office Action at 11.)

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 5, 6, 13, 22, 32, and 33, Applicants respectfully submit Matsuura et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claim 25, “except for ‘a plurality of scanning driver integrated circuit, a plurality of data driver integrated circuits’,” as asserted by the Examiner. Further, and for similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 23 and 29, Applicants respectfully submit there is no motivation or suggestion, either within the references themselves or within the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine Matsuura et al. and Lee and arrive at the invention defined by claim 25.

The rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Shiraki et al. and Matsuura et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 34 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 34 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of data drivers; a plurality of gate drivers; and a plurality of width expanders for controlling widths of data signals provided to the data lines in accordance with a distance from the data lines to the scanning signal sources; wherein a scanning signal voltage has a varying width depending on the distance of the scanning lines from the data signal sources.” None of the cited references, including Lee, Shiraki et al., and Matsuura et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

The Examiner cites Lee as failing to teach “a plurality of width expanders for controlling widths of the data signal provided to the data lines in accordance with a distance from the data lines to the scanning signal sources.” To cure the deficiencies of Lee, the Examiner cites Shiraki

et al. as teaching “a plurality of width expanders (figure 5) for controlling widths of the data signal provided to the data lines in accordance with a distance for the data lines to the scanning sources (see figure 7, column 6, lines 60-67).” The Examiner then concludes it would have been obvious to “...utilize a plurality of width expanders taught by Shiraki et al for data driver circuits ... of Lee because this would provide high quality images and the low-power consumption of a gray-scale power supply while fabricating the driving circuitry at low cost (see col. 2, lines 57-61, col. 3, lines 45-46, and col. 4, lines 14-15 of Shiraki et al).” (Office Action at 12.)

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 3, 4, 16, 19, 23, 27, and 31, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claim 34.

In continuing with the rejection of claim 34, the Examiner further states that Lee and Shiraki et al. fail to teach “a scanning signal voltage have varying widths depending on the distance of the scanning lines from the data signal sources.” To cure the deficiencies of Lee and Shiraki et al., the Examiner cites Matsuura et al. as teaching “width control means 82 for allowing the scanning signal voltage having a different width ($t_1 < t_2 < t_3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wire (see figure 14, column 23, lines 9-21).” The Examiner then concludes it would have been obvious to “...utilize width control means 82 for allowing the scanning signal voltage having a different width ($t_1 < t_2 < t_3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wire taught by Matsuura for row scanning driver circuits disclosed in the TFT-LCD system of Lee and Shiraki et al because this would minimize the variation in luminance and flickering, prevent in brightness due to the reduction of the effective display time, and thus the display quality is significantly improved (see col. 23, lines 26-30 of Matsuura).” (Office Action at 12.)

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 5, 6, 13, 22, 25, 32, and 33, Applicants respectfully submit Matsuura et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claim 34.

The rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in

view of Matsuura et al. and Shiraki et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 35 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 35 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of data drivers; a plurality of gate drivers; and a plurality of width expanders for controlling widths of a scanning signal provided to the scanning lines in accordance with a position of the scanning lines relative to the data signal sources; wherein a plurality of data signal voltages have varying widths depending on the distance of the data lines from the scanning signal sources” None of the cited references, including Lee, Matsuura et al., and Shiraki et al., either singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

The Examiner cites Lee as failing to teach “a plurality of width expanders for controlling widths of a scanning signal provided to the scanning lines in accordance with a position from the scanning lines to the data signal sources. To cure the deficiencies of Lee, the Examiner cites Matsuura et al. as teaching “width control means 82 for allowing the scanning signal voltage having a different width ($t1 < t2 < t3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wire (see figure 14, column 23, lines 9-21).” The Examiner then concludes it would have been obvious to “...utilize width control means 82 for allowing the scanning signal voltage having a different width ($t1 < t2 < t3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the signal wire taught by Matsuura for row scanning driver circuits disclosed in the TFT-LCD system of Lee and Shiraki et al because this would minimize the variation in luminance and flickering, prevent in brightness due to the reduction of the effective display time, and thus the display quality is significantly improved (see col. 23, lines 26-30 of Matsuura et al).” (Office Action at 13.)

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 5, 6, 13, 22, 25, 32, 33, and 34, Applicants respectfully submit Matsuura et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claim 35.

In continuing with the rejection of claim 35, the Examiner further states that Lee and Matsuura et al. fail to teach “...data signal voltages have varying widths depending on the

distance of the data lines from the scanning signal sources.” To cure the deficiencies of Lee and Matsuura et al., the Examiner cites Shiraki et al. as teaching “a method of driving a matrix liquid crystal panel provided supplying data signal voltages SL1, SL2, SL3 having a width enlarged ($t_1 < t_2 < t_3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning signal to the signal wires GL1, GL2, GL3 (see figure 7, column 6, lines 60-67).” The Examiner then concludes it would have been obvious to “...utilize data signal voltages SL1, SL2, SL3 having a width enlarged ($t_1 < t_2 < t_3$) in accordance with a distance from a source of the scanning signal to the signal wires GL1, GL2, GL3 taught by Shiraki et al for row data driver circuits disclosed in the TFT-LCD system of Lee and Matsuura et al because this would provide high quality images and the low-power consumption of a gray-scale power supply while fabricating the driving circuitry at low cost (see col. 2, lines 57-61, col. 3, lines 45-46, and col. 4, lines 14-15 of Shiraki et al).” (Office Action at 13.)

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 3, 4, 16, 19, 23, 27, 31, and 34, Applicants respectfully submit Shiraki et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned combination of elements with respect to claim 35.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.


Application No.: 09/327,282
Art Unit 2674
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2003

Docket No.: 8733.086.00
Reply filed January 7, 2004
Page 26 of 26

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Song K. Jung
Registration No.: 35,210

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500 (phone)
(202) 496-7756 (fax)
Attorneys for Applicant